INFORMATIONAL HEARING AND SITE VISIT

BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION

AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Application for Certification for the East Altamont Energy Center	)	Docket No. 01-AFC-4

HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS

3751 N. TRACY BOULEVARD

TRACY, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 2001

5:30 p.m.

Reported By:
Valorie Phillips
Contract No. 170-01-001

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

William J. Keese, Chairman, Presiding Member

Terry O'Brien, Commissioner Advisor

Ellen Townsend-Smith, Commissioner Advisor

Major Williams, Jr., Hearing Officer

STAFF PRESENT

Cheri Davis, Project Manager

Lisa DeCarlo, Staff Counsel

PUBLIC ADVISER

Roberta Mendonca, Public Adviser

APPLICANT

Greggory L. Wheatland
Ellison, Schneider & Harris, LLP

Alicia Torre, Manager, Project Development
Jim McLucas, Project Engineer
Steven A. DeYoung, Environmental Project Manager
Calpine/Bechtel Joint Development

ALSO PRESENT

Kirk Sornborger
Western Area Power Administration

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Public Advisor Mendonca	3
Site Visit	8
Introductions	8
Opening Comments	8
Overview of Commission Licensing Process	12
Kirk Sornborger, Western Power Administration	20
Presentation of Applicant	23
Staff Issues Identification Report	40
Janice Gan, Department of Fish and Game	44
Public Comments	
Daniel Garcia, Tri-Technic, Inc.	47
Wayne Livingston, Electricians Union	48
Nick Papadakis	50
Roberta Mendonca, Public Adviser	51
Discussion of Scheduling	52
Adjournment	62
Certificate of Reporter	63

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Shall we take our seats, please.

Good evening. This is an Informational Hearing conducted by a Committee of the California Energy Commission on Calpine Corporation's proposed East Altamont Energy Center. The Energy Commission has assigned a Committee of two Commissioners to conduct these hearings.

I'm Bill Keese, Chairman of the Commission and Presiding Member on this Committee. Robert Pernell is the second Commissioner on this Committee. He will not be able to be in attendance tonight. His -- we're hoping that we have the attendance of his assistant.

On my left is Terry O'Brien, my advisor, who will be attending this also. And Major, on my right, will be handling the -- will be our Hearing Officer and handle the heavy load of this hearing.

We are going to do introductions and introductory materials between now and five minutes to 6:00. At five minutes to 6:00, or thereabouts, we will adjourn to the buses and take a site visit. After the site visit, we will come back to this location, where I understand there

will be box lunches, and we will ask you to grab your box lunch as you come in. We will start with the formal part of the presentations immediately thereafter.

Introductions here. On behalf of the Applicant, Mr. Wheatland, would you introduce your -- the members of your team.

MR. WHEATLAND: Yes. Good evening. I'm Gregg Wheatland. I'm the attorney for the Applicant. And I will turn to Alicia Torre to introduce the other representatives that are here this evening.

MS. TORRE: Thank you, Gregg.

My name's Alicia Torre, and I'm the Project Development Manager. On my left is Jim McLucas, who is our Project Engineer. And then, if you would please stand, Susan Strachan, is our environmental consultant, and Steve DeYoung is a second environmental consultant.

Jerry Salamy, on Gregg's left, is our project manager for the environmental consultant, CH2MHILL.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

On behalf of Staff, Cheri Davis.

MS. DAVIS: My name is Cheri Davis, and

I'm the Project Manager for the Energy Commission.

To my left is Lisa DeCarlo, she's the Staff attorney for this project. And to my right is Kirk Sornborger. He works for the Western Area Power Administration, and they also have a role in this process which we will talk about a little bit later.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: And Kirk, you're next, representing Western Area Power Administration. Would you -- for the record, would you introduce yourself, and we need you to speak into both mics.

MR. SORNBORGER: Kirk Sornborger, Western Area Power Administration.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

Then we have Ms. Roberta Mendonca, our Public Adviser.

PUBLIC ADVISER MENDONCA: Good evening. I would like to give a very brief, two-part project report.

The Public Adviser's job is to make sure that people in the public are very aware of the fact that this siting case has begun and is going on in their neighborhood. So when we first received the Application for Certification at the Energy Commission, we sent flyers to 32 local

schools announcing the existence of the project.

My officer also prepared a one-page description of the project, which is located on that table, and if you'd like, you're certainly welcome to take one with you tonight. And we started to advertise this meeting tonight in the Brentwood Press, with a circulation of 15,000, the meeting announcement and the one-page project flyer.

The second part of my presentation is to tell you that the Public Adviser is here to assist members of the public who want to understand our process. And so that's why I'm really not sitting up here tonight. My job is not like the Staff's, which is to analyze the proposal, nor is it like the Commissioners', which is to make a decision about the proposal. I'm really here to help you understand the various steps of how to participate.

And speaking about participation, there are several ways to participate. One is you've shown up this evening, and there'll be an opportunity for you to offer your comments, to make statements and to let us know what you think about the project. That's offering public

opinion.

For those of you that wish to become more involved, the Energy Commission offers a process called Intervention. And Intervenors become parties to the case, like the Staff and the Applicant. To intervene, you need to file a petition. My office would be glad to help you with that. It brings you into party status, and it carries certain responsibilities. You have to file your papers, you have to serve your papers to the other parties, and you have to be available to answer any data requests that are asked of you.

The benefits include getting a copy of the Application for Certification, and when we get to our decision-making phase, if you are an Intervenor, you can introduce your own evidence, you can cross examine, and offer your own witnesses. You can cross examine the other witnesses in the case.

One more note. Tonight, when we come back from the site visit, we will be having an opportunity for public comment. I will be walking through the audience with blue cards. If you would like to make a comment, please put your name and give us an idea of what you might want to

say, and I'll walk around and collect those, and then you'll be called upon from the basis of the blue cards.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you. And we do -- this is meant as a hearing to elicit public comment, in addition to giving your comments here. If there are questions that you would like to ask, you may fill in the blue card and we'd be happy to ask those questions of the Applicant or Staff, also.

At this time, I'd -- we have accepted -- granted a motion to intervene from the California Unions for Reliable Energy, CURE. Is there anybody representing CURE who would like to identify themselves for the record?

Is there anybody representing a governmental agency? We would ask that you identify yourself for the record, and that will be up here where we have a microphone, please. We'll use the podium, because we have the recording mic and the amplifying mic.

MS. GAN: Hi. My name is Janice Gan, I work for the Department of Fish and Game.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you. Any other

representatives of counties, cities, or districts? We'll give them another chance after the site visit, I have a feeling.

Are -- I see somebody coming forward.

MS. CRAVEN: My name is Lynette Craven. I'm with Lammersville School District.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

Then at this time I will ask if there are any members of the public who wish to identify themselves for the record at this time. What we are going to do is we're going to hear, after our site visit, from our Staff, we're going to hear from the Applicant, and thereafter we will hear -- and then the agencies who are here, and at the end we will hear from members of the public.

You do not have to identify yourself at this time in order to speak at the end of our proceeding, but if you would like to identify yourself for the court reporter, and the record, you're welcome to at this time.

Do we have any members of the public who are going to be active and would like to -- we have none.

Major, are we -- I think we're ready to -- okay. I will make one final comment before

we recess to the buses. And that is, if anyone has a business card, giving it, delivering it up here would be beneficial so our reporter can get the name correct, and the affiliation.

So as -- as you comment, or particularly for representatives of jurisdictions, we would appreciate business cards.

We will then recess to the buses for our site visit.

(Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned for the site visit.)

CHAIRMAN KEESE: We are reconvened as the Committee to handle the East Altamont Energy Center. And I will, for those of you who are late arrivals, I will introduce us once more.

I'm Bill Keese, Chairman of the Commission and Presiding Member of this Committee. In addition, Robert Pernell is the Associate Member, but he is not here. Ellie Townsend-Smith, to my right, is his advisor, and will be here. Terry O'Brien, on my left, is my advisor, and will be working with us on this proceeding.

Major Williams is our Hearing Officer, and at this point, Major, would you take over.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Yes, thank

you, Commissioner Keese.

This Informational Hearing is the first public event conducted by the Committee as part of the Energy Commission's licensing proceedings on the East Altamont Energy Center. Notice of today's hearing was posted on the Commission's Web site, at www.energy.ca.gov, and sent to all parties, adjoining landowners, interested governmental agencies, and other individuals, on July 11th, 2001. In addition, notice of today's event was posted in the local newspaper, the Tracy Press.

Documents pertinent to today's hearing include a Staff Issue Identification Report filed on July 20th, 2001, and Applicant's proposed schedule, filed on August 3rd, 2001. And Staff's proposed schedule is contained in -- in their Issues Identification Report.

The purpose of today's hearing is to provide a public forum to discuss the proposed East Altamont Energy Center, to describe the Energy Commission's review process, and to identify the opportunities for public participation in the process.

Electrical energy produced by this

proposed merchant power plant would be sold in California's competitive deregulated electricity market. A merchant plant is built with private funding, without creating any direct financial liability for electricity consumers. Applicant's plan is to complete construction and start operation of the East Altamont Energy Center in June 2004.

Today's event is the first in a series of formal hearings which will extend over approximately the next year. The Commissioners conducting this proceeding will eventually issue a Proposed Decision containing the recommendations on the proposed power plant. It is important to not that, by law, the Proposed Decision must base its recommendations solely on the evidence contained in the public record.

To ensure that this happens and to preserve the integrity of the Commission's licensing process, Commission regulations and the California Administrative Procedures Act expressly prohibit off the record contacts between the participants in this proceeding and the Commissioners, their advisors, and the Hearing Officer. This is known as the ex parte rule.

This means that all contacts between a party to this proceeding and Commissioners Keese and Pernell, and their Staffs, concerning a substantive matter must occur in the context of a public discussion, such as will occur today, or in the form of written communication distributed to all the parties. The purpose of this rule is to provide full disclosure to all participants of all information which may be used as a basis for the future decision.

Today we will have presentations by Staff, Applicant, and also by Western Area Power Administration. The proposed project's interconnection with Western's substation triggers the need for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. Western will be the lead agency under NEPA and will be working jointly with the Energy Commission in the evaluation of the proposed project.

After those presentations are concluded, and any questions presented by participants are addressed, we will take comments from the public.

Commissioner Keese.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you. We're going to proceed in a little different order than may be

out there. I'm going to first ask Commission Staff to provide an overview of the Commission's licensing process and the Staff's role in reviewing the proposed project.

Cheri.

MS. DAVIS: Good evening. My name is Cheri Davis, I'm the project manager for the California Energy Commission. I'm a member of the Energy Commission Staff.

I'd like to -- she can't hear me. Can you pick this up now? Okay, we'll try it this way.

I would just like to say that there are copies of this presentation on the table back there. Some of these overheads may be kind of hard to read, and so -- just because they'll be small, and so I urge you to pick up a copy, and you can read them at your leisure when you get home.

The purpose of the Energy Commission siting process is to ensure that a reliable supply of electricity and of electrical energy is maintained at a level consistent with the need for such energy for protection of public health and safety, for the promotion of general welfare, and

for environmental quality protection.

I think that the remainder of the presentation will help you understand what those words mean.

This is one of those charts that's kind of hard to read unless you have a copy of the presentation. But I think that it's particularly helpful for understanding how all the parties play a role in this process.

You'll see at the top we have the five member Commission. Those are the decision makers. Chairman Keese is a member of the Commission. We have the two member Project Siting Committee. Chairman Keese is the Presiding Member, and Robert Pernell is the Associate Member. If you have a copy of the handout, those two are reversed. I apologize. You might just want to use -- draw an arrow to switch the two. And then the Hearing Officer, Major Williams, is -- conducts all the hearings.

What I'd like to draw your attention to are all the parties on the bottom. That's me, Cheri Davis. You'll notice that all these parties are lined up on the same row. That means that we all have equal access to the decision makers.

Major Williams gave a brief discussion of the ex parte rule, and that's -- that's what I'm talking about when I say that we have equal access to the Commissioners. If we're going to talk about substantive matters relating to this case, we have to do that in a public forum.

The Applicant is Calpine, and Alicia Torre, who introduced herself earlier this evening, she's the project manager for Calpine. We rely very much on coordination between these different parties. We rely on the Applicant for additional information about the project. We rely on local, state and federal agencies to provide comments on the project. We rely on Intervenors and the public to point out issues that we may not have considered in the past.

So why are we here. The Energy Commission's role is -- the Energy Commission is the permitting authority for power plants that are greater than 50 megawatts -- for thermal power plants that are greater than 50 megawatts, and their related facilities such as transmission lines, water supply systems, natural gas pipelines, waste disposal facilities, and access road.

We are the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, also called CEQA, and the Western Area Power Administration is the lead federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act. When I say Western, that's the Western Area Power Administration. I introduced Kirk a little earlier this evening, and he'll have a few words to say at the end of my presentation.

I'd just like to reiterate Western -- why Western is involved in this project. It's because Western owns the substation that this project will be hooking into. Which is what I say here.

Because Western owns that -- that project, this triggers the requirement for environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act. The Energy Commission -- CEC stands for California Energy Commission -- and Western coordinate on the CEQA and NEPA process. The reason why we coordinate is because it's much more efficient to do so. We're both doing very similar types of analyses, and, frankly, it would be a waste of the taxpayers' dollars if we did it separately.

Now I'm going to talk about Staff's analysis. Remember that I am a member of the Energy Commission Staff. There are several other members of the Energy Commission Staff in the audience. And the headline says Staff's analysis of the AFC. AFC means the Application for Certification. This big binder here is an Application for Certification. Actually, that's only part of it. It contains a whole lot of information.

So what do we do when we get this? We evaluate the various elements of the project. We determine if the proposal complies with laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, or LORS, for short. We conduct an engineering and environmental analysis, we identify issues with the project. We evaluate alternatives to the various elements of the project. We identify mitigation measures. That means ways that if there's -- if there are impacts, how can they avoid those impacts or compensate for those impacts. And we recommend conditions of certification. And that's exactly what it sounds like.

We also facilitate public and agency

participation, mainly by holding workshops where you can come and provide comments at any time.

The Staff produces two documents, the Preliminary Staff Assessment, called the PSA, and the Final Staff Assessment, the FSA. And I put in parentheses there, there's the draft EA. EA stands for Environmental Assessment. That's the NEPA, the federal equivalent of the PSA, in this case. And the final EA will be the federal equivalent of the Final Staff Assessment.

And finally, we make recommendations to the Committee. We do that through our reports.

I mentioned that we work with local, state and federal agencies. And these are just a few that are listed here. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is one of the federal agencies that we do a lot of work with. And I put Western Area Power Administration at the bottom with a little star next to them. That's because we're going to be working so closely with the Western Area Power Administration. I won't go through and read all of this because it's in your handouts.

So I just described to you that Staff does this independent assessment of the project. And we produce the two products, the Preliminary

Staff Assessment and then the Final Staff Assessment.

So what happens after we produce the Final Staff Assessment, that's what FSA stands for. The Committee issues the Presiding Member's Proposed Decision, or PMPD. The Presiding Member's Proposed Decision contains many of the same elements that are -- that are in the Staff's assessments. It contains findings relating to environmental impacts, public health, engineering analysis, project compliance with laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. Recommends Commission -- conditions of certification and recommends whether or not to approve the project. After that, the full Commission makes a decision.

And finally, the Energy Commission monitors compliance with all conditions of certification for the life of the project. And that includes after -- after the life of the project, when the project is closing. We monitor to make sure that in the act of closing they are not creating additional impacts.

I'd like to say just a few words about the public process. Our workshops and hearings are notices 10 to 14 calendar days in advance.

Mailing lists, we have a number of different mailing lists. The one that you'll probably care about the most is our general mailing list. There are sheets back there, sign-in sheets. We urge you to sign up and we'll put you on our mailing list. You'll receive notices of all of our workshops. You'll receive a notice of availability when our assessments come out so that you can get a copy of them, if you'd like. So please do so, if you'd like to be on our list.

The documents, such as the hefty Application for Certification, are available for public review at public libraries, the Energy Commission's library, the Energy Commission's Web site, and the Dockets Unit at the Energy Commission. The Dockets Unit is sort of a clearing house for documents that are important to a case. When I receive something, such as a comment from an agency that I think is important, I have it docketed. And on the Energy Commission's Web site you can pull up the dockets log and it's a list of everything that's been submitted to dockets pertaining to this case. You can contact dockets then and get a copy of that.

There are a number of different ways you

can participate in these proceedings. You can submit written comments, which we urge you to do, or statements to the Commission. You can provide oral comments at public meetings. You can become a formal Intervenor, as Ms. Roberta Mendonca, our Public Adviser, described earlier. And you can provide written comments on the Preliminary Staff Assessment or draft Environmental Assessment.

And I'm not going to try to read this to you. These are various contacts for the project, and I have business cards if you'd like to take them with you. We urge you to -- to call -- I urge you to call me if you have questions about the project. I urge you to call Roberta Mendonca if you have questions about how to participate in this process.

With that, I'd like to turn the floor over to Kirk Sornborger -- am I saying your last name right?

MR. SORNBORGER: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. With the Western Area Power Administration, and he'll just say a few words about their role in this process.

MR. SORNBORGER: Thank you. I have no nice slides. I'm here in an introductory role.

My name is Kirk Sornborger. I'm the Project Manager for the Western Area Power Administration.

Western Area Power Administration is a marketing administration within the Department of Energy. We maintain and control the federally operated transmission lines and substations that are located throughout the state of California.

Since Calpine is requesting an interconnection with the Western Transmission System, Western, as the lead federal agency, will determine the feasibility and impacts associated with the interconnection. The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA as it's commonly referred to, is the procedural tool that provides the guidance that directs the federal government for environmental analysis.

The NEPA process is intended to provide federal decision makers and the public with information on the proposed action, as well as to find alternatives and mitigations for the proposed action.

The NEPA process focuses on public participation and public input. The public involvement process provides a means of

identifying the concerns, needs and values of interested parties, and provides the cornerstone of the decision making for Western.

In the coming months Western will be soliciting input from the public. I encourage all interested parties to participate.

Thank you for this opportunity.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you, Kirk. And I do want to emphasize for you what you heard about the role of Staff. Commissioner Pernell and I are the Committee. The people who work for us with whom we communicate about this case are the people sitting up front here. Applicant is proposing a project. We don't talk to them unless we're talking to them in a room like this, in front of you.

We deal with our Staff exactly the same way. Staff is an independent party to this case. They can't come to my office and talk about this case. They send me the same messages that you're entitled to, and when they put a presentation on they put it on in a public forum, in front of you.

Do we have any questions about the process? If anybody -- I think Staff has laid it out pretty clearly. As they've mentioned, they

have copies of this in the back, with phone numbers and e-mail addresses, and you can contact them. If anybody has a process question. All right.

Then we will move to the Applicant, and they will give us a presentation on what we saw on our bus ride.

If you want to -- do you feel comfortable speaking at the podium? If that works for you, it's got both microphones.

(Inaudible asides.)

MS. TORRE: Can we dim the lights to make that a little more visible, or -- there are also copies.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: That's fine.

MS. TORRE: I want to thank you all for coming here tonight. It's a work night, and we really appreciate the turnout.

My name is Alicia Torre, and I'm the Project Development Manager for the East Altamont Energy Center. In that role, I am responsible for the development and overall licensing of the East Altamont Energy Center for its sponsor, Calpine Corporation.

And I plan to go through some basic

background information on Calpine and the Energy Center, and then I will ask Jim McLucas, our Project Engineer, to give a brief overview of the technologies to be used at the East Altamont Energy Center.

Calpine is a local company with national stature. The company was founded in 1984. The office responsible for managing this project is the Western Region Office located in Pleasanton. In addition, we have two other major offices in California, the corporate headquarters is in San Jose, and our engineering office is in Folsom for the entire country.

Calpine is -- leads the world in production of renewable geothermal energy, and is a leader in clean natural gas-fueled generation. Developing, building, and operating clean, reliable, low cost electricity in 29 states, Canada, and the United Kingdom. All together, that represents over 43,000 megawatts.

I'd like to put that in perspective with -- in regard to California. The summer peak demand in California is roughly between 45 and 50,000 megawatts, so the 43,000 figure for Calpine nationwide and in the United Kingdom is roughly

equivalent to the peak demand, a little bit less than the peak demand in California.

Calpine has a very big commitment to new power generation in the nation, and has a goal of 70,000 megawatts by the year 2005.

Calpine has been a good neighbor and a responsive corporate citizen in the communities in which it's located.

Moving to the next slide. Calpine is very proud of our operations safety record, and highly trained staff. Training is not just a one-time event. Calpine operators receive ongoing training throughout the project life.

There are a lot of different generating companies. Calpine has a long term commitment to its projects. Calpine manages all aspects of its facility development, from the initial concept through site acquisition, engineering, licensing, construction, and operation. And we operate all the plants, you know, that we build. And will build.

In operations, we have, as you can see up there, 8600 megawatts. Those are 39 gas fueled plants and 19 geothermal energy centers. In construction, we have 14,000 megawatts, 27 gas

fueled facilities under construction in the United States and Canada.

At this point I think most of you have probably experienced California's energy crisis first-hand sometime over the last year. Office lights or home electricity may have gone out. California demand is outstripping supply. No major generating facilities have been built in over a decade. Antiquated polluting power plants are unreliable. California has always relied on a fair degree of imports from other states, and those other states which are experiencing low growth and booming economies are not always in a position to export power any longer. So out of state imports can be costly and not always available.

This next slide shows a picture, and those words are pretty hard to read so let me read them for a minute. An energy facility on the left, generation. The little green thing is labeled substation. The towers, such as you saw on the bus tour today, are high voltage transmission going back to the little green symbol there, for distribution, and poles that look more like what we're familiar with on our streets that

bring electricity to homes and businesses.

It used to be that regulated utilities, like Pacific Gas and Electric, produced and transported electricity from the generation point all the way through to homes and businesses. California has deregulated generation, and companies like Calpine now produce electricity in generating plants that are privately owned, and which are not paid for by either taxes or through -- through rates established by commission.

And that energy is sold on net or long term contracts, or even sold hour by hour, both to agencies and through the California Independent System Operator.

So it's a little different now. You have companies like Calpine producing electricity at the front end, and then you still have the high voltage transmission system and the distribution lines bringing power to your home, which are still owned by entities like Pacific Gas and Electric. Think of the high voltage transmission system like the interstate highway; low voltage system like local roads. So you have those steps in delivery to homes. And Calpine is not in the transmission

or distribution business, but just in the generation.

Moving on, Calpine has a very major commitment to California. We have -- we are in the process of a $6 billion commitment to the state of California. We have three energy centers that are under construction right now. Those are the Delta Energy Center, in Pittsburg; Gilroy Peaking Plants; and the Pastoria project. We have 1100 megawatts that have just gone into operation this summer, the Sutter Power Plant and the Los Medanos Energy Center. And that is contributing to helping California have fewer blackouts this summer.

The aim is to have 12,000 megawatts installed by 2005. Again, to put that in perspective, that would be roughly almost a quarter of California's peak requirements in the summer.

Calpine was also the first company to enter into a long term contract with the state of California, in an aim to bring stability to California prices.

The next picture is a picture from the intersection of Byron Bethany Road and Mountain

House Road. When we -- if, going back to the site tour, this is the view after we had taken the loop around to look at the PG&E gas compressor station and came back onto the highway, and were headed south. And you were then pointed out that we were going past the site again. That intersection is where this view is from. And this is a simulation of what the plant would look like when built.

First, if I could point out a few things. Of course, you got the wood pole towers going down the street that are already there. And if you recall, there were those lattice towers that cut across the edge of the site. So that's not part of our project. That's already there. And in this picture it's a little bit faint, but on the far right-hand corner, you can see parts of the Western Area Power Administration's substation.

The three most prominent elements in this picture are those three stacks. Those are the stacks for the heat recovery steam generators which are associated with each of three gas turbines.

The East Altamont Energy Center is using an environmentally responsible natural gas fueled

combined cycle technology. This kind of technology results in 60 to 90 percent fewer emissions than old technology gas fueled facilities. The project is an 1100 megawatt facility, and that is enough energy to supply approximately 750,000 to a million homes.

The project is a $550 million investment that is privately financed. So that capital is not paid off through utility rates or through your taxes.

As I think you heard on the site tour, the land under option is a 174 acre site, and the footprint of the facility, which is in the middle field, is approximately 55 acres. Farming will continue on the remainder of the site. The project is slated to start construction in the summer of 2002, and be operational in the summer of 2004.

The project has a great deal of community benefits. First of all, it will have over 400 union construction jobs. Once it's in operation there will be 30 to 35 permanent full-time high paying jobs. The annual payroll for the plant is $1.7 million.

Property taxes from the new facility are

approximately $5 million a year. We will also be procuring local services and supplies in order to operate the plant. And Calpine has been a strong corporate support for community programs in the other communities in which we have facilities.

And again, I think it's very important that Calpine sticks with these plants over a very long time. We're not a company that builds plants and then sells them to other people to operate. Calpine operates its plant and has a very good record for clean, safe, reliable and affordable energy for California.

This next slide will be very familiar to those of you who were on the bus tour. But if you've just been able to join us, this shows an aerial view, you know, of the sort of area around the plant and the infrastructure facilities. There are packets up here at the table, and if you weren't able to go on the bus tour, do be sure to pick one up and this -- this aerial photograph is in there.

The yellow line shows an outline of the 174 acre parcel. There's a little bit of it at the north end that is cut off there. If you can see on the bottom right corner there's a road, and

that is the Byron Bethany Road. The plant site is where the cross is. That's the middle of the center field, approximate location of the -- of the stacks. Those are part of the plant.

The road that is running at the bottom of the -- running -- running to the top of the page and running across the bottom of the site is Kelso Road. And if you -- if we proceed up that road from -- from our project, the next facility across -- across Mountain House Road from us is the Western Area Power Administration Substation. The part that is open is the 500 kV switchyard, and are the switchyard -- the part of the yard that we -- that the Modesto-Turlock lines connect into, which are the lines that will be looped into our facility, is the 230 kV yard, which is a little bit further to the left.

Proceeding up the road, the next facility is the Delta-Mendota Canal. You can see it looks like a dark line there. That's the Delta-Mendota Canal, and its pump station for that canal is -- is the next facility. And then the next -- the next thing that's identified with an arrow is the PG&E gas compressor station. That's approximately 1.4 miles from the site.

Beyond that in this aerial picture, but this was not visible to you on the bus tour today, you can see the Department of Water Resources pumping station for the California Aqueduct, and you can also see the California Aqueduct, that black line in the top, you know, running down at an angle to the right-hand side.

From the PG&E gas compressor station on our tour, we turned north on Bruns Road, and the -- the water for this project will be coming from Byron Bethany Irrigation District from -- from their take point on the California Aqueduct, it'll be coming down a -- a gravel road and onto our site.

Let's see. I guess the main -- the main thing I want to really, sort of walking through the tour, maybe that's a little silly since a lot of you have just had it, but the main point I'd really like to make about this site is this is why we're here.

The reason that this site is selected is it's close to all of the infrastructure required for a power plant. And by being close to a source for gas, electricity, and water, we're able to reduce the length of linears, and therefore also

reduce our impact on people who, you know, are -- we don't want to be in the business of building 25 mile transmission lines. You know,, we're trying to reduce that as much as possible, and that's why we're here in this location.

And I think at this point I'd like to turn the presentation over to Jim McLucas, who is our Project Engineer, who will take you through some of the technologies used at the plant.

MR. McLUCAS: As -- as Alicia said, this is a -- we're using a combined cycle generation technology for this project. The majority of the projects now being built in California are of this design. It's got a very good efficiency, and reliability.

The -- the prime generators on this are combustion turbines, or gas turbines, which are much like the -- the engine that hangs off a wing of an aircraft. Only in this case, instead of propelling an aircraft, it's used to drive a generator to produce electricity.

In this case, we'll have three combustion turbines. The combustion turbines then take air, compress the air, combust it with natural gas, and then the hot exhaust products

then are -- pass through a heat recovery steam generator, which is the big boxy type thing shown in -- it's tan. And then from there, the exhaust products are exhausted to atmosphere through the stack. And those were the -- the prevalent features that Alicia was pointing out on the -- on the visual simulation.

The heat recovery steam generator is designed to recover heat from the exhaust gas, to generate more electricity in a steam turbine. So the exhaust gas enter the heat recovery steam generator about 1100 degrees, and exit the stack in the vicinity of about 150 degrees. All of that exhaust heat is -- then generates steam at three different pressures, and those steam flows are then routed to the steam turbine, drives the steam turbine to produce additional electricity through another generator.

So this is what we call a three by one project, and that means it's got three combustion turbines that share then a single steam turbine.

The steam exiting the steam turbine is under vacuum at -- close to almost a full vacuum. So at that point it's -- it's in the vicinity of about 120 degrees. And the water use on this

project is used to condense that steam. So there's a surface condenser on the outlet of the steam turbine that is -- into a heat exchanger, where the -- the steam is on the shell side. There's circulating water that then passes through the tube side, condenses the steam back to water that is then pumped back to the heat recovery steam generators and just continues in that cycle.

The cooling water then, that's used for the condenser, is passed through a cooling tower that uses an evaporation process then to reject that heat to atmosphere. So the -- the primary water demand for this project is for makeup for the cooling tower to replace the water that's lost to evaporation.

I just want to touch on a couple of the environmental benefits. The design of these combined cycle projects reduces emissions 60 to 90 percent as compared to some of the older generation plants. That's a function of two -- two things working together. One is that emissions technologies have gotten that much better over the years to where we have such low concentrations of emissions exiting the stack that it -- it gets difficult to even measure. Coupled

with the fact that the project is much more fuel efficient, up to 40 percent as compared to some of the older projects.

So not only are you producing less emissions for the natural gas that you're using, but the fact that you're using less natural gas then helps to reduce emissions that much further.

The water management plan for this project is -- is designed to minimize the use of water through recycling water to the maximum extent possible.

We are proposing a zero liquid discharge plant, so that the cooling tower blowdown, which is a requirement because of the concentration of dissolved solids in the cooling tower, would be recycled on within the project process, and we have additional equipment then that extracts the -- the water back out of that stream, funnels it back into the process, and it results in then a very small stream of concentrated brine. And then that brine would be kept onsite in evaporation ponds to remove the rest of the moisture, and so that what's left over is just a salt cake.

And we're doing that to -- to preserve the water quality in the area, as there's --

there's not really a -- a place that could readily accept the high TDS blowdown water from the cooling tower without impacting other water bodies.

As was shown on the previous visual simulation, there's extensive landscaping proposed around the perimeter of the energy center to integrate it with the local surroundings.

And, I guess lastly, the technology that this project's using has been supported by environmental and health organizations; specifically our project in San Jose, the local chapter of the American Lung Association and the Sierra Club have supported that project.

Just to touch a little bit on the emissions control process that we use. The -- to remove nitrous oxides, oxides of nitrogen, we use a selective catalyst reduction system, and that's where there is catalyst material that's -- that's sandwiched in in the heat recovery steam generator, in the exhaust stream, where ammonia is injected upstream of that catalyst, and then as it passes over the catalyst, the ammonia reacts with the NOx to form nitrogen and water vapor.

The SCR is considered a Best Available

Control Technology by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, who would be the permitting agency for the air -- air emissions for this project.

The ammonia that's used in the SCR process is a -- is a widely used product. Eighty percent of the ammonia produced is used in agriculture as a fertilizer, as many of you in this area probably are aware of. And then the remaining 20 percent for commercial and industrial uses, primarily in refrigeration process. It's much like freon is used in refrigeration. Ammonia can provide the same -- same sort of function.

I think I just want to kind of skip over this slide. I think Cheri did a real good job of presenting the whole process there.

And with that, we can get on to questions, I guess.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Actually, what I'm going to do, before we -- if Staff is ready, what we -- we've heard -- now heard about the project. Staff's role is to represent the public in this process and present the -- the issues that impact the public. That's why Staff has asked for your input. So before we go to the public for

questions and -- and the -- we'll start, actually, with the Intervenor, then the -- then the jurisdictions, and then the public.

But before we do that, I would like Staff to mention the issues that they see in their preliminary look, their preliminary cut at this. So if Staff would give us those issues, then we will go to questions.

(Inaudible asides.)

MS. DAVIS: About this time in the process, Staff issue their Issues Identification Report. There's a copy of that on the table, and I urge you to take a copy.

The purpose of this Issues Identification Report is to inform all participants in the case of potential issues that Staff have identified early on in the process. It allows us to focus early on on these issues. But it's not -- it's not limiting, in the sense that there may be other issues that crop up along the way. These are just the issues that Staff have identified at this time. This is pretty early in the process.

The criteria for what goes into this report are if there are impacts that may be

difficult to mitigate; if it appears that there may be a noncompliance problem with laws, ordinances, regulations or standards; if there are potentially contentious issues; or if there are issues that may impact the schedule.

Staff identified these potential issues, and then I'll briefly describe them, and only very briefly. Again, look in the Issues Identification Report for a more in depth discussion of these.

In air quality, the Applicant proposes emissions control for oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, and ammonia, that do not meet with recent EPA determined best available control technology. That concerns Staff.

Staff disagrees with the Applicant's proposed mitigation for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter.

Staff disagree with Calpine's modeling assumptions, and -- for oxide of nitrogen, and Staff are concerned that the project may cause a new violation of the one hour NO2 ambient air quality standard. Related to that, Applicant has also not provided any mitigation for those emissions.

Under land use, the Applicant is

proposing to build on prime farmland. That is a potential nonconformance issue with laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It's also a potential significant impact under CEQA. That's the California Environmental Quality Act.

Related to that, jumping to soils, a lot of that land is being taken up for the evaporation ponds. It's an inefficient use of land and water, from the perspective of Staff. And this amount of space would not be necessary if the Applicant were to use some alternative technology, such as dry cooling or alternative wastewater technologies. Staff will be exploring that in this process.

Under noise, the power plant is projected to raise noise levels by 14 decibels. The typical threshold for significance is 5 decibels. Therefore, 14 -- a 14 decibel increase in noise levels could represent a significant impact.

However, this is a quiet environment, and it is unclear whether 5 decibels is an appropriate threshold for this type of environment.

Under visual resources, the project will be larger in scale and more massive than some of

the surrounding structures, and it will be visible from two county designated scenic routes. Also, the project plumes will be visible at large distances.

Staff have issued what we call data requests. This is where we ask questions of the Applicant. The responses for those should be coming in August 17th.

And a lot of our data requests are aimed at better understanding these issues. Throughout this process, the Staff will continue to ask questions of the Applicant to try to understand the issues, to identify whether these impacts can be significant, and if they are, if it's possible to mitigate them.

Also in our Issues Identification Report is Staff's proposed schedule for the project. I don't think this has been mentioned yet, but this is a 12 month schedule, and the clock starts ticking when the application is approved, is --

MS. DeCARLO: Deemed data adequate.

MS. DAVIS: -- data adequate, thank you. Which was June 27th.

The dates I would like to call your attention to --

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Let's deal -- we'll deal with the schedule later.

MS. DAVIS: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: If you don't mind.

Is that it? Okay.

Do we have a representative of the Intervenor, CURE, here?

All right. Then we had two agencies who indicated presence at the front end. I would ask -- it was the Department of Fish and Game, wasn't it? Do -- do you have any comments at this time? Comments, question?

MS. GAN: Hi. My name is Janice Gan. I work for Fish and Game, I'm a biologist in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

And I just came to kind of present Fish and Game's issues with this project to the people that came to this meeting.

That area supports -- that general vicinity supports a number of listed species and species of concern, including California red-legged frogs, California tiger salamander, kit fox, and burrowing owl. There's quite a few raptors that use that area for foraging. And, if they can find a tree, for a nesting.

So I guess we just wanted to make sure that the project was going to mitigate impacts to those species, in terms of their evaporation ponds and just the change in the land use on that many acres. So -- and there's a few permits that Fish and Game is probably going to be involved in issuing for this project, possibly a 1600 streambed alteration permit for the crossings, probably in your pipeline connections. If you're not going to be boring, you might be going through some jurisdictional areas.

And another one would be an endangered species take permit, or a consistency determination for probably impacts to kit fox habitat. And just commenting on the CEQA process, as a trustee resource agency.

I guess that's it.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you. Thank you very much.

And for the audience, that -- that is the kinds of issues that Staff and Applicant will be dealing with with probably a half dozen to a dozen different agencies.

The representative of the school district, any comments?

Do we have any other public agencies who were not here when we did the identification of public agencies, who would like to comment? Or identify themselves for the record.

All right. I have two sets of questions that have -- certainly. Ellie.

MS. TOWNSEND-SMITH: Good evening. It's late now. I'd like to ask the Applicant a couple of things. I'm curious to find out if the -- in terms of air quality, I have two questions.

Has the Applicant looked any -- looked any further into SO2? Have you looked at mitigation for SO2, which was identified in the Issue Identification Report? And also, I want to verify again, what type of ammonia, is it aqueous or anhydrous? And how many times per week do you plan to deliver your ammonia to the site?

MR. RUBENSTEIN: For the record, my name's Gary Rubenstein, with Sierra Research. We're air quality consultants for the project.

I'll answer Ellie's first question, and I think Jim McLucas will then answer the second one about the ammonia.

We -- we have received a request, as you know, from the Commission Staff regarding the

issue of SO2 mitigation. Typically, the Energy Commission views sulfur dioxide emissions from natural gas power plants as being truly negligible, and typically does not require mitigation. We're going to explore that with the -- with the Staff, and see whether they think that there's something unique about this project that requires mitigation, and if it is required, we'll provide it.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Sir, could you leave your business card with the reporter so she'll have that? Thank you.

MR. McLUCAS: Relative to -- relative to the question on ammonia, we're proposing to use anhydrous ammonia. And the quantities would be one truckload every one to two weeks.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: That it, Ellie?

MS. TOWNSEND-SMITH: That's it.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Okay. Now we have -- we'll take questions from the public, and Mr. Garcia. Daniel Garcia. At the podium, so that we can get it recorded, please. There -- there is a transcript of this hearing that will be available.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. My name's Dan

Garcia, and I'm President of Tri-Technic. We're an electrical contractor.

And one of the -- you did answer one of my questions, which was the project, whether it was going to be union or non-union. And you identified union workers, so I'm assuming that it's going to be a union project.

I'm just -- due to the magnitude and size of the project, and I was just wondering if Calpine is going to be doing any kind of small business subcontracting opportunities during this project. I know that -- that the timeframe that threre's going to be larger contractors involved, due to the size, but if there's going to be any type of opportunities for small contractors to be involved with the construction of the project.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

MS. TORRE: I guess I'd like to ask you if I could get your card, and answer that question after conferring with people. I'm not -- not aware of company practices on this question. I'd like to answer it accurately.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

Wayne Livingston.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Good evening. My name

is Wayne Livingston, and I reside in Manteca, California, and I represent the Electricians Union, and speak in favor of this project.

Done a lot of generators, not near this big, but around the area. There's one there by Lathrop, behind a defunct, I guess, shopping center, what you call those factory stores. Can't hear it at all. Barely see steam escaping from it. So, again, a very small area. This is in a very remote area, and should work for us.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

Okay. Now is the time for any other member of the public who cares to speak, to speak.

We, as we've said we encourage public participation. We're glad that you you're here. We hope everybody who cares about this project participates at the earliest stages. If you -- the Staff will be -- we'll be talking about the schedule in just a moment, and the Staff will be telling you when they would like to have their first workshop, and they will have workshops here to pursue the questions that they've raised and any other questions you have.

If there are questions that you've got,

it would be nice to hear about them now so that Staff can be prepared and bring them up at the workshop.

Feel free. No, you don't have to have a card for this. This is -- this is free time here.

MR. PAPADAKIS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members. Nick Papadakis, from Byron. A native, actually, about four and a half miles from the proposed project there.

I'm also a member of the Byron Municipal Advisory Council, and we've discussed this, and the Municipal Advisory Council is in full support of this. Byron one of these days is going to break open, so we can use all the energy we can get. So we're in full support of it.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you very much.

MR. PAPADAKIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Do you have a question?

MS. TOWNSEND-SMITH: I just have a technical -- another technical question.

Has the Applicant looked at all at dry cooling for this particular plant?

MR. McLUCAS: We have not done an analysis specific to this project. We're in the midst of that in response to a question from the

Staff. But on other projects of this size we've gone through this analysis, and it typically does not -- is not justified, from an economic standpoint.

PUBLIC ADVISER MENDONCA: Chairman Keese, I received two public comments.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Okay.

PUBLIC ADVISER MENDONCA: One was from a resident who said that mandatory routing of all ammonia shipments to -- should never pass the school -- and I believe it's a local school -- at any time day or night, and deliveries of the ammonia should come from the Byron Highway only.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you. For the -- for the audience, you -- you saw issues identified. Traffic was not one of them, but traffic is one that is always an issue that Staff will pursue with the Applicant. So traffic will be discussed at the workshop.

PUBLIC ADVISER MENDONCA: And a second comment from a local realtor. It's my opinion that the location of the proposed power plant is suitable, and impact on the surrounding area will be minimal and well controlled.

And while I have the microphone I'd like

to give a comment. For those of you that didn't want to fill out a blue card or come to the microphone to ask your questions, there is a filled out comment sheet that you can take home. If you get it back to me, my e-mail address is on it, or you can mail it to the Public Adviser, and we will see to it that it gets docketed, becomes a part of the record, and pass it along to Staff.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

Last chance for the public comment.

Major, would you take over scheduling, please?

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Ms. Davis was about to get into the scheduling. She can pursue that now, if she will. Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: Again, you have a copy of this proposed schedule in the handouts.

What I'd like to call your attention to are just a few of the key dates here.

The first is the -- if I can point to it -- is Staff holds data response/issues resolution workshop. That date is tentative, August 28th. Right now we are trying to work out a workshop

date that will work for a good deal of the Staff people, because we want to have Staff people there to address your questions and hear your comments. Also, we need to coordinate with Western Area Power Administration, and until we can work out a date I thought I'd put down August 28th as something that I'd like to shoot for.

The next important date, or a date that will be important to you, is the Staff files a Preliminary Staff Assessment, and the draft Environmental Assessment. Again, the Environmental Assessment is part of Western Area Power Administration's documentation. This is the date that we propose, the Applicant has proposed another date. They've proposed an earlier date.

And then the next date that you'll be concerned about is the -- is January 3rd -- or, I'm sorry, January 23rd -- January 3rd is when Staff would conduct workshops on the Preliminary Staff Assessment and the draft Environmental Assessment. And finally, January 23rd will be when Staff proposed to file the Final Staff Assessment, or the final Environmental Assessment.

When we produced this -- this schedule we were a little bit optimistic about the date for

the Final Staff Assessment. January 23rd -- the dates between the Preliminary Staff Assessment and the Final Staff Assessment, we don't really have enough days in there, given that there's a lot of holidays in the middle. And so what we've put down here is February 1st, which we feel is a more realistic date for the Final Staff Assessment.

And I would just like to note for the Committee that that date would be day 219 of this process, and the Final Staff Assessment typically falls between day 200 and 220. But it's very important that Staff has sufficient time between the Preliminary Staff Assessment and the Final Staff Assessment to have the workshop, gather comments, sometimes those comments raise new issues, and Staff have to pursue those issues before issuing the Final Staff Assessment.

And then there's the holidays in between. And so that is why we feel that February 1st is a more appropriate date.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you, Ms. Davis. I will let you know that the Committee had noted that coming in. You have reinforced our opinion that that period would be much too short, over Christmas.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Does the Applicant have anything to offer in terms of a proposed schedule?

MR. WHEATLAND: Yes. We propose a slightly different schedule. We would propose to move the PSA up approximately two weeks earlier. The reason for that is, is that typically, the PSA workshops are held five to fifteen days after the issuance of the PSA. If we are to issue the PSA on December 14th, as proposed by the Staff, that means the workshops would fall December 19th, the 29th. A very difficult time, I think, for -- for many parties, and especially the public.

So if we're able to advance the issuance of the PSA by a couple of weeks, I think we'd have a much better time for scheduling the workshops.

Also, we've tried to accelerate our response to the data requests. We've already responded to the first set of data requests, and we will be responding to the second request a few days ahead of schedule. This, we hope, would also help the Staff in accelerating the date for the PSA.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Wheatland.

Are there any further comments on the issue of scheduling?

MR. O'BRIEN: I have one question for the Applicant, in terms of the dates for the PSA and the FSA. But then going to a final decision date that the Commission will have on -- on this project, sometime next June or -- or approximately. I don't know where day 365 falls.

But does that -- is there an issue -- the Applicant is asking for the PSA to be advanced earlier than what the Staff has proposed. Is part of the rationale for that on the part of the Applicant in terms of a concern regarding the end date that the Commission may make a final decision on the project? And if that is the case, why is that?

MR. WHEATLAND: Yes, that is also a concern for us. One year would fall roughly June -- around June 26 of 2002. We had earlier indicated to the Commission, during the data adequacy phase, that it would take us approximately 24 months for construction. If we receive a final decision by the middle or end of June, we will not have the project online in time for the start of the summer of 2004.

By -- if we can accelerate this AFC schedule by just a short amount, so that perhaps having a final decision by the end of May, would make it much easier for us to have the project constructed and completed and online by the beginning of the summer of 2004.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Wheatland.

MS. DAVIS: I have one comment.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: Is this on? Do I need to flip a switch or something? Okay, this one -- okay.

The Applicant's proposed schedule had the Final Staff Assessment being filed January 8th. And this -- this is the same comment that I had earlier about the holidays. I -- with -- even if the Preliminary Staff Assessment were filed November 29th, as the Applicant has proposed, we feel that the January 8th date for the Final Staff Assessment would not be feasible.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Thank you.

MR. O'BRIEN: I have another question for the Applicant.

In terms of the Calpine project in

Sutter, the Sutter project, do you know offhand the number of months it took to construct that project?

MS. TORRE: You can see the two of us up here are pretty focused on our own project. We're seeing if one of our compatriots can answer your question.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: I'll help you a little, because I -- I think we -- you started and then you stopped because of litigation, and there was an intermittent start/stop to that. So I'm not -- I think it would be difficult to say exactly what the construction period was. Well, the beginning started three times, I think.

MR. O'BRIEN: And just one other question. Is it the Applicant's contention that the construction period at this point in time is anticipated to be 24 months?

MR. McLUCAS: That's true. That's true.

MS. TORRE: I would like to add -- I'd like to add to that answer that Sutter, being a smaller plant, would -- would ordinarily have a shorter construction period than a three by one. A 24 month schedule for a three by one would be similar to what a 21, 22 month schedule for a two

by one.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Let me ask Applicant, or the Staff a question. If -- Staff probably is not aware of the time, the construction hours on the Sutter project, but they were limited to hours that would not interfere with the neighbors who live there. This -- this site is in a generally remote location. Would Staff generally apply the same working hours to this project?

MS. DeCARLO: Well, let's see. As I mentioned previously --

CHAIRMAN KEESE: I mean, do we apply the --

MS. DeCARLO: Generally we apply certain hours, based upon the county --

CHAIRMAN KEESE: To every project.

MS. DeCARLO: -- right. But there has been an Executive Order issued by Davis that allows round the clock construction for power plants. So that is potentially a feasible way to go about this.

CHAIRMAN KEESE; Thank you.

MS. TORRE: May I --

CHAIRMAN KEESE: We're -- sure.

MS. TORRE: I think this would be

interesting to, you know, because this is a union labor construction project and because there's a great deal of construction going on in California, there are limited people you can hire for construction crews. If we were to attempt, for example, to make up a one week delay in permitting, if you are having your crews work three hours of overtime daily you're looking at, you know, 15 days of overtime to make up that lost week in a permitting schedule.

And, of course, when people are working very long days, and are more tired, I guess I personally worry that, you know, if your workforce is overstretched and tired, that's when accidents could potentially occur --

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Sure. Let --

MS. TORRE: -- even with the best effort.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: -- let me ask the Staff one more question.

MS. TORRE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: How long have you given, how much time have you given to the Committee to come up with its Preliminary Decision? In your schedule, in your schedule how

long have you given this Committee to come with its decision?

MS. DAVIS: I don't know if I can add that up that quickly. But I guess I would like to reiterate that the Final Staff Assessment date that we chose was day 219, and typically anything between -- our Final Staff Assessment is issued anywhere between day 200 and 220. And so that would be following a very typical schedule.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: Okay. To -- to the gentlemen on my right here, this Committee will take much shorter time in issuing its decision than is typical and is generally looked for in the schedule.

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: With that said --

(Laughter.)

HEARING OFFICER WILLIAMS: The Committee must issue a scheduling order within 15 days, or by -- by my count, anyway, August 24th, 2001. And, of course, we will address the issue of scheduling. It will be set forth in our scheduling order, and we will look at it very closely based upon the discussions here today.

CHAIRMAN KEESE: With that, I thank

everybody for coming and joining us, urge the public again to get your questions in early, talk with our Staff, talk with the Applicant.

Look forward to the first workshop in about three, four weeks. Good night.

(Thereupon, the hearing was concluded at 8:25 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, VALORIE PHILLIPS, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Informational Hearing; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said Hearing, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said Hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 17th day of August, 2001.

VALORIE PHILLIPS